



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,293	07/18/2003	Wei-Yang Su	81,608-C1	4115

7590

07/14/2005

Legal Department
Huntsman LLC
P. O. Box 15730
Austin, TX 78761

EXAMINER

NYALLEY, LANSANA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1621

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/623,293

Applicant(s)

SU ET AL.

Examiner

Lansana Nyalley

Art Unit

1621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-20 are pending

Applicants' argument and Examiner's Response.

Applicant's arguments filed 06-03-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because:

Applicants argued that the reference failed to every aspect of the claimed invention. More specifically, Applicants argued that the reference failed to teach the claimed limitation that " the amount of tertiary amine produced during said process is less than 3.0% by weight of the total amount of secondary amine produced."

The Examiner finds this argument persuasive. Therefore, the Examiner is withdrawing the previous 102(b) and 103(a) rejections in the office action mailed on 04-06-2005 which relied on column 4, lines 38-54, the 99% purity of the product, in favor of the new 102(b) and 103(a) rejections which rely on the absence of any mention of a tertiary amine that forms during the reaction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Speranza et. al. (US patent 5,001,267)..

Applicants recite a process for producing a secondary amine product which comprises heating a mixture comprising hydrogen, a carbonyl compound represented by the given formula and a primary amine reactant represented by the given formula to recited temperature range and under the recited pressure in the presence of an effective catalytic amount of a catalyst and wherein the amount of tertiary amine produced during said process is less than 3.00% by weight of the total amount of secondary amine produced.

Speranza et. al. disclose a process for producing a secondary amine product which comprises heating hydrogen, a methyl alkyl ketone of the given formula and an amine of formula in the presence of a palladium catalyst on carbon charcoal to produce a product of purity of more than 99%. (See column 4, lines 38-54). There is no mention of tertiary amine.

The Speranza et. al. reference failed to mention that any tertiary amine forms during the reaction. However, the Examiner has no reason to believe that any tertiary amine forms during the said reaction.

Thus, since less than 3.0% by weight of tertiary amine includes zero percent by weight of tertiary amine formed, then it is the Examiner's position that the claim limitation of less than 3.% by weight of tertiary amine formed is met.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2, 7-8, 10-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Speranza et. al. (US patent 5,001,267) in combination with Tahara et. al. (US patent 4,373,107), further in view of Oude Alink et. al (US patent 3,994,975) and Speranza et. al. (US patent 3,110,732).

WHAT APPLICANTS CLAIM.

Applicants recite a process for producing a secondary amine product which comprises heating a mixture comprising hydrogen, a carbonyl compound represented by the given formula and a primary amine reactant represented by the given formula to recited temperature range and under the recited pressure in the presence of an effective catalytic amount of a catalyst and wherein the amount of tertiary amine produced during said process is less than 3.00% by weight of the total amount of secondary amine produced.

DETERMINATION OF THE SCOPE AND THE CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART (M.P.E.P. 2141.01).

Speranza et. al. disclose a process for producing a secondary amine product which comprises heating hydrogen, a methyl alkyl ketone of the given formula and an amine of formula in the presence of a palladium catalyst on carbon charcoal to produce a

product of purity of more than 99%. (See column 4, lines 38-54). There is no mention of tertiary amine.

The Speranza et. al. reference failed to mention that any tertiary amine forms during the reaction. However, the Examiner has no reason to believe that any tertiary amine forms during the said reaction.

Thus, since less than 3.0% by weight of tertiary amine includes zero percent by weight of tertiary amine formed, then it is the Examiner's position that the claim limitation of less than 3.% by weight of tertiary amine formed is met.

**ASCERTAINMENT OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PRIOR ART
AND THE CLAIMS (M.P.E.P. 2141.02).**

The difference between Speranza et. al. (US patent 5,001,267) and the claims in the instant application is that Speranza et. al. do not disclose a catalyst comprising palladium on carbon nor do they disclose the said carbon comprising charcoal.

Speranza et. al. (US patent 5,001,267) do not teach a process of using isophone diamine, diisopropyldiisophone diamine or an alkoxyated amine as the amine reactant.

Tahara et. al. and Oude Alink et. al. teach the difference.

Tahara et. al. teach a process for preparing an N-alkyl-alkylene-diamine by reacting an aldehyde with an alkylene diamine in the presence of hydrogen and a catalyst comprising palladium on carbon and the carbon comprising charcoal (See column 1, lines 1-68 and column 2, lines 1-48).

Oude Alink et. al. teach a process of producing a cyclohexyl amine, such as, isophone diamine, by reacting an isophone compound with a primary or secondary or any other amine in the presence of hydrogen and palladium catalyst (See column 1, lines 1-68, column 2, lines 1-68).

Even though Oude Alink et. al. do not specifically disclose a diisopropyldiisophoneamine reactant, this reactant is embraced by the genus disclosed by Oude Alink et. al. (See column 1, lines 39-54 and column 2, lines 16-50).

Speranza et. al. (US patent 3,110,732) teach a process of producing an alkoxyated amine compound by reacting a primary amine with a carbonyl compound in the

presence of sodium or potassium alkaline catalyst (See column 1, lines 45-27 and column 2, lines 1-72).


**FINDING OF PRIMA FACIE OBVIOUSNESS-RATIONAL AND
MOTIVATION (M.P.E.P. 2142-2143).**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have looked to the teachings of Speranza et. al., Tahara et. al. and Oude Alink et. al. for a reaction that involves a carbonyl compound with an amine compound in the presence of hydrogen and palladium catalyst. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because Speranza et. al., Tahara et. al and Oude Alink et. al.. are all directed to the preparation of secondary amine by reacting a primary amine with a carbonyl compound in the presence of palladium catalyst.

Base on the above, Speranza et. al., Tahara et. al. and Oude Alink et. al., teach all the elements of the claimed invention with sufficient guidance, particularity and with reasonable expectation of success that the invention would be prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill (the prior art references teach or suggest all the claim limitations with reasonable expectation of success. See M.P.E.P. 2143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lansana Nyalley whose telephone number is 571,272,0697. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:45 to 4:45.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571 272 0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



PAULA A. ZUCKER, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Lansana Nyalley, Ph.D.
06/29/ 2005

P. Johann Richter, Ph.D., Esq.
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Technology Center 1600